



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,174	03/16/2006	Simon Jeremy East	357358.00003-US	5211
78905	7590	03/17/2010	EXAMINER	
Saul Ewing LLP (Philadelphia)			FAN, HUA	
Attn: Patent Docket Clerk				
2 North Second St.			ART UNIT	
Harrisburg, PA 17101			PAPER NUMBER	
			2456	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2010	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/572,174	EAST ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	HUA FAN	2456	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2456

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to amendment/reconsideration filed 11/25/2009, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1-16 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following issues.

**(A) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) with regard to claims 1-6 and 10-12**

**Issue:** The applicant argues (on pages 9-10) with respect to claim 1 that Chow does not teach the new limitation “the remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been updated and is to be sent to the device”.

The applicant argues on page 10, paragraph 2 that Chow teaches that the user specifically identify the web pages that are to be watched for updates. However, since the claimed limitation is "the remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content **that has been updated**", not “to be watched for updates”, the applicant’s argument is moot. Chow teaches that “identifying ...content that has been updated" is performed by the remote computer without explicit user request (col. 5, lines 50-65, “(6) **spontaneously** updating of the cache when objects of interest have changed”).

**(B) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with regard to claims 16**

**Issue:** The applicant argues (on page 11) with respect to claim 16 that Chow in view of Desai does not teach the new limitation “send that log to a remote computer automatically without any explicit request to watch for updates of specifically identified content...”.

The applicant argues on page 11 that neither Chow nor Desai teaches this limitation. The examiner disagrees. Chow teaches (b) send that log to a remote computer automatically without any explicit request to watch for updates of specifically identified content (col. 5, lines 15-21, the user sends request for resource from the remote computer, the resource manager, using the created log, without any explicit request to watch for updates. The log was created as shown in col. 5, lines 15-17, “supplying the resource locator in the form appended to modified objects previously accessed”).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chow et al (US patent 6029175).

As to claim 1, Chow et al discloses a method of providing content to a mobile web browsing device from any of several different web servers, comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving at a remote computer (figure 1, "Revision Manager", connected to both the device (figure 1, "Any CCI capable Web Browser") and each of those web servers (figure 1, "Remote HTTP Server 4a, 4b, and 4") over a network (figure 1), a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by that specific device, the log being generated and sent by the device (col. 4, line 57- col. 5, line 3, user's local machine is the device that sends the log of data, a resource in URL that the Revision Manager retrieves for the user, "when the user **views the modified retrieved object, the form allows the user to specify whether this is an object of interest**"; col. 5, lines 32-38, the user of the device sent to the Revision Manager **the object of interest**, which is a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by the user of the device, such as "the unmodified URL for the object" as disclosed in cline 38 of col. 5. It is to be noted that the claimed limitation "a log of data identifying content that has been viewed by that specific device" is interpreted as a log that contains any type of content that has been viewed by that specific

Art Unit: 2456

device; if the applicant was intended to claim a narrower scope, the applicant is suggested to amend the limitation to clarify);

(b) the remote computer identifying automatically without explicit user request any of that viewed content that has been updated (col. 5, lines 50-65, “(6) **spontaneously** updating of the cache when objects of interest have changed”. The word “spontaneously” indicates automatically without explicit user request) and is therefore to be sent to the device (the limitation (c) below inherently teaches this “to be sent to the device” limitation);

(c) the remote computer automatically causing only that viewed and any of that updated content stored on any of the web servers to be sent to the device over the network (col. 4, lines 5-12, “only those pages that a client specifically requests to be updated automatically”; lines 34-39, “automatically to the change in the information within a previously viewed document”; col. 10, line 67 – col. 11, line 3; col. 14, lines 9-13, “saving the cache information file and sending the WWW document back to the client”);

(d) causing that viewed and updated content to be automatically stored in device memory (col. 5, lines 50-65, “(6) spontaneously updating of the cache when objects of interest have changed; (7) notification of interested parties when objects of interest have changed”; col. 4, lines 25-39, “when the Revision Manger is located close to multiple users... shared local cache...accessing a shared cache of automatically updated documents...”. The shared cache is equivalent to the device memory).

As to claim 2, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the log is generated at the device and replicated at the remote computer (col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 5; figure 26, for

Art Unit: 2456

example, “http://www.teknowledge.com/HBURST/”, is generated at the user device and replicated at the Revision Manager, so that it can altered and presented to the user).

As to claim 3, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer views multiple content from the web server and determines if the content has changed (col. 10, lines 60-67, the Revision Manager receives multiple content, the entire updated document, or a status code, and determines if the content has changed; figure 21; col. 19, lines 28-35, “response status code” and an attached updated document).

As to claim 4, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer views multiple content from the web server and determines when the content has changed (col. 10, lines 60-67, the Revision Manager views multiple content, the entire updated document, or a status code, and determines when the content has changed when the viewed content is determined to be the entire updated document; figure 21; col. 19, lines 28-35, “time value”).

As to claim 5, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer is notified by the web server if the content on the server has changed (col. 10, lines 60-67, “status code”).

As to claim 6, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer directly sends updated content to the device or causes the updated content to be sent to the device (col. 5, lines 50-65, “(6) spontaneously updating of the cache when objects of interest have changed; (7) notification of interested parties when objects of interest have changed”; col. 4, lines 25-39, “when the Revision Manger is located close to multiple users... shared local cache...accessing a shared cache of automatically updated documents...” is equivalent to “directly sent”; col. 10, line 67 – col. 11, line 3 is equivalent to “indirectly sent”).

As to claim 10, see 112 rejection and examiner's interpretation above. Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer determines how long the cached data on the phone should stay cached before the data is removed and the device goes back to using a normal download from the web server (claim 5; claim 71, (b)).

As to claim 11, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the remote computer sends data to the device that automatically causes the device to display a link to new content (figure 30, "this is an update from: <http://www.teknowledge.com/HIBUST>"), the new content being automatically stored on the device (see similar rejection to claim 1).

As to claim 12, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the device includes a user interface that indicates whether given content is already stored in device memory or not (figure 26, "Alert me on source update for: <http://www.teknowledge.com/HIBURST>/" indicates the original content is already stored in device memory (retrieved at least once already), see col. 4, line 57 - col. 5, line 3).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 7-9 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Chow et al, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Desai et al (US2003/0088580).

As to claim 7, Chow et al discloses the method of Claim 6 in which the remote computer is connected to both the device and each of the web servers over a network (see rejection to claim 1), and wherein the remote computer makes a decision whether or not to send, or cause to be sent, the updated content (figure 21, col. 19, lines 30-65), but does not expressly disclose a



Art Unit: 2456

wireless network or taking into account one or more of the following: (b) how often the user views the content; (e) what an operator of the wireless network wants to promote. Desai et al discloses a wireless network ([0022], “mobile computing device”) and taking into account the following: (b) how often the user views the content (Desai et al, [0032], lines 4-8); (e) what an operator of the wireless network wants to promote (Desai et al, [0034], lines 3-6).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Chow et al, with the teachings disclosed by Desai et al regarding a wireless network and taking into account one or more of the factors listed above. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to extend the applicability of the system to a widely accepted network type, wireless network, and also to make the updating procedure configurable to improve user friendliness.

As to claim 8, Chow-Desai discloses the method of Claim 7 in which the operator of the wireless network set thresholds for at least one of the above conditions (Dasai, [0032], lines 11-18; [0033], lines 21-23, “weighting coefficient”). It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the method of setting threshold for one of the conditions to setting the threshold for more conditions.

As to claim 9, Chow-Desai discloses the method of Claim 7 in which these thresholds are controlled at the remote computer and so can be updated at any point by the operator if it wants to implement different caching strategies (Desai, [0032]; [0033]).

As to claim 15, Chow-Desai discloses the method of Claim 1 in which the updated content is sent at off-peak periods or to otherwise fill bandwidth troughs (Desai, [0008]; [0023], lines 39-44).

Art Unit: 2456

As to claim 16, Chow et al discloses a web browsing device able to download and store content from a web server over a wireless network, wherein the device is programmed to:

(a) create a log of data identifying the content that is being viewed by the device (col. 5, lines 15-17, “supplying the resource locator in the form appended to modified objects previously accessed”);

(b) send that log to a remote computer automatically without any explicit request to watch for updates of specifically identified content (col. 5, lines 15-21, the user sends request for resource from the remote computer, resource manager, using the created log, without any explicit request to watch for updates), the remote computer being connected to the web server and the device over the wireless network (see similar rejection to claim 1);

(c) receive from the web server any content that has been identified by the remote computer as having been updated (see similar rejection to claim 1; **it is to be noted that “any content” in this limitation is not limited to be the contents in the log.** If the applicant intended to claim otherwise, then clarification of the claim language is suggested);

(d) automatically store only that viewed and updated content in memory (see similar rejection to claim 1).

Chow et al does not expressly disclose a mobile device. Desai et al discloses a mobile device ([0022], “mobile computing device”).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings disclosed by Chow et al, with the teachings disclosed by Desai et al regarding a wireless device. See similar motivation in rejection to claim 7.

Art Unit: 2456

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Chow et al, in view of Desai et al., as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Blumenau (US publication 2004/0078292).

As to claim 13, Desai et al. disclose recording the history of pages of the Web site serviced by the Web server and viewed by the user of the device ([0029]); however, Desai et al. does not expressly disclose the log also records the time that a specific item of content was viewed by the device. Blumenau discloses recording the time the content is viewed ([0063].

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Chow-Desai, with the method disclosed by Blumenau regarding recording the time the content is viewed. The suggestion/combination would have been to determine the duration of the content display (Blumenau, [0063]).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Chow et al, in view of Desai et al., as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Forsyth (US publication 2004/0077340).

As to claim 14, Desai et al. discloses recording the history of content viewed by the user of the device ([0029]), but does not expressly disclose the log identifies whether content that is being viewed is updated content that had earlier been stored in device memory. Forsyth discloses a method of indicating whether the content is already stored in device memory or not (abstract; figure 7).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method disclosed by Chow-Desai, with the method disclosed by Forsyth regarding indicating whether the content is already stored in device memory or not. The suggestion/motivation of the combination would have been to improve user friendliness.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUA FAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5311. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2456

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rupal D. Dharia/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2400

/H. F./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2456